<div align="center">**REMARKS**</div>

Claims 166-185 are pending in the application. Claims 166-185 currently stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Examiner Consultation

The Applicant respectfully requests consultation with the Examiner, at the Examiner's earliest convenience, to discuss the current case and expedite prosecution.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 166, 168-172, 176, and 178-182 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,687,241 (hereinafter "Goss"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 166 provides for using a cookie to setup a voice call *from* a user device *to* a call center resource, over which voice communications are exchanged. In contrast, Goss teaches using a cookie to setup a voice call *from* a call center resource *to* a user device. To the extent Goss discusses using the cookie to route a call-back request to a call center resource, the call-back request itself is not a call over which voice communications can be exchanged. Rather, the subsequent call placed back to the user is a call over which voice communications can be exchanged, but as mentioned previously, this call is placed from the call center resource to the user. Thus, Goss fails to anticipate claim 166.

In particular, claim 1 recites receiving a voice call from a user device, including a cookie. The cookie is processed to select a first call center resource. A routing instruction indicating a route from the user device to the first call center resource over which voice communications are exchanged is then generated. In other words, the cookie is used to setup the voice call from the user device to the call center resource.

In contrast, in Goss a cookie is gathered from a user when the user initiates a call-back process via a PC with a Web browser (Goss, col. 4, lines 1-10 and col. 7, lines 32-67). At this time, the user has not called the call center. Rather, an agent in the call center, at a later time, calls the user at which point telephony can proceed (Goss, col. 9, lines 47-56). The agent is selected based on information contained in the cookie (Goss,

<div align="center">6</div>

col. 7, lines 62-67). In other words, the cookie is used to setup a voice call from the agent to the user.

Goss also teaches that a call back process may be initiated in response to a voice call placed by a user to a call center over a PSTN (Goss, col. 10, lines 30-31). However, in this case, no cookie is included.

Thus, in the entirety of Goss, a cookie is used only to setup a call from the agent to the user. However, in order to anticipate a claim the MPEP requires that the elements be "arranged as required by the claim" (MPEP 2131; In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Goss does not arrange the elements as required in claim 166. That is, even in examples whereby the user calls the agent, the call does not include a cookie to setup a voice call from a call center resource to a user device, as required by claim 166.

Moreover, claim 167 further requires receiving a redirect instruction in the call server, processing the redirect instruction to select a second call center resource, generating a second routing instruction indicating a second route for the voice call originating *from* the user device *to* the second call center resource, and transferring the second routing instruction to be used when routing the voice call *from* the user device *to* the second call center resource over which voice communications will be exchanged. Goss does not teach these aspects.

Rather, Goss teaches transferring a call-back request – not a voice call originating from the user device. For example, in Goss a customer may download a callback applet to a browser (Goss, col. 12, lines 54-56). The customer then enters the phone number that they desire to receive a callback on and then click a "Call Me" button on their browser (Goss, col. 12, lines 56-59). A call-back request is then provided to an agent's Screen Pop application (Goss, col. 13, lines 10-13). At this point, without receiving a call from the user device or commencing the call-back, the agent may determine the need to transfer the call to another Call Center (Goss, col. 13, lines 13-15). The Call Center may then route the call to another agent that commences the call. Thus, Goss clearly does not teach generating a second routing instruction indicating *a second route for the voice call originating from the user device to the second call center resource* because the

transferred call-back initiates a call commenced by an agent – not a user, as required by claim 167.

Goss therefore fails to anticipate claim 1 and an indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 166 is allowable in view of the cited reference, and such indication is respectfully requested. Independent claim 176 contains limitations similar to those of claim 166, and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 166.

While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. The Applicant further submits that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. No estoppel is intended and no estoppel should apply to assertions in the recent Office Action that are not refuted herein. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Patrick L. Muino /
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Patrick L. Muino, Reg. No. 64,863
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280
E-mail: patrick@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004
Attn: Melissa A. Jobe
Sprint
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100